

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

# DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

**LORENZO MORENO,**

Case No. 3:25-cv-00034-MMD-CLB

Plaintiff,

## ORDER

v.

**UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT,**

**Defendant.**

Defendant.

Pro se Plaintiff Lorenzo Moreno attempts to sue the United States Government under § 1983, but his complaint (ECF No. 1-1 (“Complaint)) is an incomplete narrative that states no claim for relief. Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation (“R&R”) of United States Magistrate Judge Carla L. Baldwin (ECF No. 5), recommending this case be dismissed with prejudice because the Complaint’s incomprehensible nature makes it impossible for the Court to identify the factual or legal basis for his claims, and Plaintiff does not explain his cause of action or how he is entitled to relief. To date, no objections to the R&R have been filed. Because there is no objection, and as further explained below, the Court will adopt the R&R.

Because there is no objection, the Court need not conduct de novo review, and is satisfied that Judge Baldwin did not clearly err. See *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1116 (9th Cir. 2003) (“De novo review of the magistrate judges’ findings and recommendations is required if, but only if, one or both parties file objections to the findings and recommendations.”). As mentioned, Judge Baldwin reviewed Plaintiff’s Complaint, and properly determined that the underlying facts (“I was arrested fore no reason and done innocent time”) and the relief sought (“36 hondred zillion benjamin fraklins 600 zillion times” and “12 casinos to be built in Reno Nevada”) do not allow the

1 Court to identify the factual or legal basis for Plaintiff's claims. (ECF No. 1-1 at 4, 6.) See  
2 FED. R. CIV. PRO. 12(b)(6); 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

3 Having reviewed the R&R, Judge Baldwin did not clearly err.

4 It is therefore ordered that Judge Baldwin's Report and Recommendation (ECF  
5 No. 5) is accepted and adopted in full.

6 It is further ordered that the Clerk of Court file the Complaint (ECF No. 1-1).

7 It is further ordered that Plaintiff's Complaint (ECF No. 1-1) be dismissed with  
8 prejudice.

9 It is further ordered that Plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (ECF  
10 No. 4) be denied as moot.

11 The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

12 DATED THIS 7<sup>th</sup> Day of February 2025.

13  
14  
15   
16 MIRANDA M. DU  
17 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28